

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over the patent to Kaneshige.

Claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of the patent to Kaneshige in view of the patent to Chang.

Also, the disclosure is objected to.

In connection with the Examiner's objection to the disclosure, applicants have amended the first paragraph on page 2 of the specification as required.

After carefully considering the Examiner's grounds for the rejection of the claims over the art, the claims have been retained as they were.

Turning now to the Examiner's rejection of the claims over the art, it should be emphasized that the Kaneshige patent discloses a device which is similar to the device defined now in claim 1 in that it discloses a screened housing for microwave circuits, comprising a housing body having an interior, said housing body being open at at least one side thereof, a cover 11 closing said interior of said housing body, a substrate 12 mounted on an inner side of said cover 11, and means forming a plurality of chambers provided for accommodating of individual circuits 17 so that said individual circuits 17 are screened from one another, said means including said substrate 12 from said inner side of said cover and a plurality of webs 13.

It is again respectfully submitted that column 4, lines 4-12 of the patent to Kaneshige specifically disclose that the substrate 12 is formed and the shielding effect of the webs or walls 13 is obtained by plating the inside and walls of the cover with nickel, copper and other suitable material. This teaching is quite positive in that the walls 13 must be present before the substrate/plating 12 is formed. Therefore, there can be no question of the Kaneshige teaching to form these webs or walls directly on the substrate 12 as defined in claim 1 of the present application.

It is therefore believed to be clear that the patent to Kaneshige does not teach the new features of the present invention.

The patent to Chang which was applied in combination with the patent to Kaneshige also does not teach the new features of the present invention.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 1 together with other claims currently on file should be considered as patentably distinguishing the present invention from the prior art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Any costs involved should be charged to the deposit account of the undersigned (No. 19-4675). Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a

personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233